

## REMARKS

The present application was filed on February 14, 2002 with claims 1 through 14. Claims 1 through 14 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nelson et al. (United States Patent Publication Number 2003/0095663) and rejected claims 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson et al. in view of Sowa et al. (United States Patent Publication Number 2002/0154781). The Examiner indicated that claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Independent Claims 1 and 11-14

Independent claims 1 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nelson et al. Regarding claims 1 and 13, the Examiner asserts that Nelson teaches loading a number of keys in a controller (i.e., client transmit key and client receive key), the number set so that a device connected to the wireless network can miss being re-authenticated for a predetermined number of the time periods and still communicate in a secure manner on the wireless network.

Applicants note that Nelson describes the process of authentication and reauthentication in paragraph 23. In particular, Nelson teaches that,

in a shared key environment, the access point confirms that all connected clients return a message using the most recent client transmit key before beginning to transmit on the most recent client receive key. Alternatively, the access point may use a fixed number of duplicate key messages, i.e., retries, in the absence of positive acknowledgement from the client that the key messages have been received and processed. ***Once all clients are on the correct WEP key pair, signal exchanges are continued.***  
(Paragraph 0023; emphasis added.)

Nelson also teaches that, “in that case, a client that fails to switch over to the new key pair would be ***required to re-authenticate to gain access to the network.***” (Paragraph 0014; emphasis added.) Independent claims 1 and 12-14 require loading a number of keys in a controller, the number set so that a device connected to the wireless network *can miss being re-authenticated*

*for a predetermined number of the time periods and still communicate in a secure manner on the wireless network.* Independent claim 11, as amended, requires loading a plurality of keys, the number set so that a device connected to the wireless network *can miss being re-authenticated for a predetermined number of the time periods and still communicate in a secure manner on the*

5 *wireless network.*

Thus, Nelson et al. do not disclose or suggest loading a number of keys, the number set so that a device connected to the wireless network can miss being re-authenticated for a predetermined number of the time periods and still communicate in a secure manner on the wireless network, as required by independent claims 1 and 11-14, as amended.

#### 10 Additional Cited References

Sowa was also cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of, for example, loading a fixed key, and loading at least one additional key, wherein the number of keys comprises the fixed key and the at least one additional key (page 2, paragraph 0026-0031). Sowa, however, does not address the issue of loading a number of keys, wherein the number is set so that a

15 device connected to the wireless network can miss being re-authenticated for a predetermined number of the time periods and still communicate in a secure manner on the wireless network.

Thus, Sowa et al. do not disclose or suggest loading a number of keys, the number set so that a device connected to the wireless network can miss being re-authenticated for a predetermined number of the time periods and still communicate in a secure manner on the

20 wireless network, as required by independent claims 1 and 11-14, as amended.

#### Dependent Claims 2-10

Dependent claims 1-4 and 10-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nelson et al. and claims 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson et al. in view of Sowa et al.

25 Claims 2-10 are dependent on claim 1 and are therefore patentably distinguished over Nelson et al. and Sowa et al., alone or in combination, because of their dependency from independent claim 1 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim. The Examiner has already indicated that claim 9 would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-14, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: January 3, 2006

Kevin M. Mason  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 36,597  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-6560